

**REMARKS**

Claim 1, 4 and 7-10 were rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5 and 8-11 of U.S. Application 10/819086. Applicants request that this rejection be held in abeyance until the indication of allowable subject matter in this application. At that time, Applicants will compare the claim language in the two applications and respond to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 1-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomasz in view of Keate.

Claim 1 recites “wherein, with the exception of the surface acoustic wave filter of the tuning module, all circuits within the tuning module, the analog/digital conversion stage and the digital processing block are disposed within an integrated circuit that is fabricated on a single monolithic substrate.” The Examiner points to Tomasz Figure 3 and the teaching at col. 1, lines 6-8. Tomasz teaches “a highly integrated television *tuner* fabricated on a single microcircuit device” (emphasis added; col. 1, lines 6-8). Thus, what Tomasz teaches is simply the integration of the *tuner components* on a single integrated circuit substrate. This is clearly shown in Figures 2 and 3 which refer to the single integrated circuit 216 including just the analog tuning circuitry. The digital signal processing is performed in other circuitry, not included in integrated circuit 216. In fact, Figure 3 shows a separate digital signal processor IC 4. There is no teaching or suggestion for the DSP IC 4 to be included on the same integrated circuit substrate as the analog tuner. This is confirmed by the reference to the signals being received by the DSP IC 4 as being quadrature output IOOUT and QOUT signals from the integrated circuit 216.

Turning to Applicants' claim 1, it will be noted that the "single monolithic substrate" is fabricated to include all circuitry of: the tuning module (except for the SAW), the analog/digital conversion stage and the digital processing block. Importantly, the claim language requires both analog and digital components (tuning module circuit such as the conversion circuitry, A/D conversion, digital block) to be fabricated on the single monolithic substrate. This is not the case in Tomasz which clearly puts analog and digital circuitry on different integrated circuit substrates. The claimed invention accordingly is distinguished from the teachings of Tomasz relied upon by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner has failed to make out the prima facie case for rejecting claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite: "an integrated circuit embodied on a single monolithic substrate in which" certain "circuit components are fabricated on that single monolithic substrate." The certain components at issue include both analog and digital components (upconversion, downconversion, A/D conversion, digital baseband filtering) to be fabricated on the single monolithic substrate. The teachings of Tomasz relied upon by the Examiner focus on the integration of just the *tuner components* on a single integrated circuit substrate. This is clearly shown in Figures 2 and 3 which refer to the single integrated circuit 216 including just the analog tuning circuitry. The digital signal processing is performed in other circuitry, not included in integrated circuit 216. In fact, Figure 3 shows a separate digital signal processor IC 4. There is no teaching or suggestion for the DSP IC 4 to be included on the same integrated circuit substrate as the analog tuner. This is confirmed by the reference to the signals being received by the DSP IC 4 as being quadrature output IOUT and QOUT signals from the

integrated circuit 216. The claimed invention accordingly is distinguished from the teachings of Tomasz relied upon by the Examiner.

Claims 28 and 41 are asserted to distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as recited above with respect to claims 1 and 11.

The Office is authorized to charge any additional claim fee necessary for entry of this response to deposit account 07-0153 (reference 361170-1028).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for favorable action and allowance.

Dated: May 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andre M. Szuwalski

Registration No.: 35,701

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP

3000 Thanksgiving Tower

1601 Elm Street

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 999-4795

Attorneys For Applicant